

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/074,180	02/12/2002	Walter Lange	Mo6874/LeA 34,067	7005
34947	7590 10/31/2003	·	EXAMINER	
BAYER CHEMICALS CORPORATION			OH, TAYLOR V	
100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	10
		•	DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/074,180	LANGE ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Taylor Victor Oh	1625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM							
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	Sentember 2003					
2a)□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.					
3)	<u> </u>						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application	1	· f				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8 and 9</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6) Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
	on Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Examin						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. 							
Attachmen							
2) D Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice o	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

The Status of Claims:

Claims 1-9 are pending.

Claims 8-9 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-7) in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.

Claims 8-9 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected groups II, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Priority

1. It is noted that applicants have satisfied the requirement of 35 USC 119 by filing priority documents, Germany 10107151.5, Feb. 16, 2001, Germany 10115405.4, April. 29, 2001, Germany 10152789.6, Oct. 25, 2001.

Art Unit: 1625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrases "a cinnamic acid derivative" and/or "an acrylic acid derivative "are recited in the claims. However, the term "derivative" is without further clarification by the specification. Therefore, an appropriate correction is required.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "mixtures thereof" is recited in the claim. However, this phrase is vague and indefinite because there is no disclosure or passage related to the various mixtures of the catalyst composition containing PdCl₂, PdBr₂, Pd(NO₃)₂, H₂PdCl, and etc in any proportion recited in the specification. Therefore, an appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 1625

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated clearly by Coulton et al (WO 00/07993).

Coulton et al discloses 2-chloro-4-fluorocinnamic acid compound (see page 35 ,lines 25-26). This is identical with the claim.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated clearly by Novelli et al (WO 00/08023).

Novelli et al discloses 4-chloro-2-fluorocinnamic acid compound (see page 21,lines 29-30). This is identical with the claim.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated clearly by Brouwer et al (US 4,979,982).

Brouwer et al discloses 3-(2-chloro-4-fluorophneyl)-2-propenoic acid compound (see col. 5, line 52). This is identical with the claim.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated clearly by Kelley et al (US 5,708,033).

Kelley et al discloses 2-chloro-4-fluorocinnamic acid compound (see col. 10, line 17). This is identical with the claim.

Art Unit: 1625

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saumitra et al (J. Chem. SOC. PERKIN Trans, p. 1943-1944, 1993) in view of Kikukawa et al (J. Org. Chem. 1981, Vol. 46, No. 24, p. 4885-4888).

Art Unit: 1625

Saumitra et al discloses a method of preparing a halogenated cinnamate compound by reacting arenediazonium tetrafluoroborates with an olefin in the presence of 1-2 mol% of Pd(OAC)₂ (see page 1943, left col. lines 24-32). For another example, a solution of NaNO2 in water was added to a mixture of p-anisidine (8.13 mmol) in 42% HBF₄ (20.62 mmol); ethyl acrylate (11.13 mmol) and Pd(OAC)₂(0.5 mmol) were added to the mixture under heating, thereby obtaining the desired product (see page 1944, left col. lines 20-28).

However, the instant invention differs from the reference in that at least two of the substituents on the phenyl ring are halogen in the starting material.

Kikukawa et al teaches a method for phenylation of olefins by aniline under palladium catalysis (see page 4886, table III), during which a diazonium salt is formed in situ (see page 4887, right col., lines 15-18). Furthermore, different forms of palladium complexes, such as , palladium (II) acetate (see page 4887, right col., line 5), tetrakis (triphneylphosphine)palladium (see page 4887, right col., line 20) can be applied to the method. Moreover, Kikukawa et al indicates that the current method offers several advantages: high product yields under mild conditions and tolerance of substituents on both olefinic substrates and arylamines (see page 4887, right col., line 31-34).

Saumitra et al does disclose the method of preparing the halogenated cinnamate compound by reacting arenediazonium salt with ethyl acrylate in the presence of Pd(OAC)₂, and similarly, Kikukawa et al does teaches the method for phenylation of olefins by aniline in the presence of palladium (II) acetate catalyst; also, the Kikukawa et al method makes it possible to add substituents such as chlorine (see page 4886, table II) on the arylamine compounds. Both references are directed to the preparation of the halogenated cinnamate compound. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan in the art to have motivated to incorporate the Kikukawa's et al teaching of tolerance of substituents on arylamines into the Saumitra et al method in order to prepare the polyhalogenated cinnamate compound.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taylor Victor Oh whose telephone number is 703-305-0809. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on 703-308-4698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

